

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

significant differences between independent claims 1, 12, 17, 28, 29 and 35 submitted by the Applicant and Shon and Tobagi.

Shon

As amended, in a pertinent part, claim 1 recites “the bandwidth parameters including at least a minimum bandwidth parameter indicating a minimum amount of bandwidth the at least one traffic group needs to be provided over a defined time period.”

As understood by the Applicant, Shon grants priority if the buffer is full (see col. 7, lines 13-16), hence relying on relative priority to define the importance of a particular traffic group, where traffic groups with a higher priority are preferred over those with lower priorities. The Applicant's invention as recited in claim 1, however, requires the use of bandwidth parameters including at least an indication regarding a minimum amount of bandwidth a particular traffic group needs to be provided over a defined period.

Importantly, if the sum of the minimum bandwidths for all traffic groups defined is less than or equal to 100% of the available bandwidth, then the scheduling processing can assure that each traffic group will receive at least the minimum bandwidth requested.

The set of bandwidth parameters, including minimum, maximum and peak bandwidths, in combination with the variety of traffic classification schemes gives a network manager enormous control and flexibility in prioritizing and managing traffic flowing through packet forwarding devices in a network, versus relying on relative priority (see specification, pages 3, 16 and 19-20).

backlog, continuous attempts are made to transmit packets of each type whenever possible (see col. 7, lines 54-58). For at least this reason, claim 29 is distinguishable over Tobagi.

With regard to independent claim 35, as amended, limitations similar to those discussed with respect to claim 29 apply. Accordingly, for at least this reason, the Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection to this claim.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection,

Shon in view of Tobagi et al.

In the parent case, the Examiner rejected claims 3, 14 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 5,499,238 of Shon, in view of US Patent No. 5,381,413 of Tobagi. The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's characterization of this combination of references. The Applicant respectfully submits the claims, as amended, are thought to overcome the reasons for rejection. Claims 3, 14 and 19 are dependent claims including the limitations of the, amended, independent claims as discussed above. Claim 3 depends on claim 2, which depends on independent claim 1. Claim 14 depends on claim 13, which depends on independent claim 12. Claim 19 depends on claim 18, which depends on independent claim 17.

Again, as understood by the Applicant, Shon generally relates to a relative priority scheme. Shon grants priority if a buffer is full (see col. 7, lines 13-16), in order to define the importance of a particular traffic group. As discussed above, each of the independent claims recite the use of bandwidth parameters indicating at least a minimum amount of

1. The first part of the report discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions, including sales, purchases, and expenses. It emphasizes the need for consistency and transparency in financial reporting.

Conclusion

For the reasons cited above, claims 1-3, 5-6, 9-20, 28-29 and 35-38 are thought to be in condition for allowance. If the Examiner finds any remaining impediment to the prompt allowance of these claims that could be clarified with a telephone conference, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Michael DeSanctis at (303) 740-1980.

Charge our Deposit Account

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date:

6/20/2000

Mike Holt

Michael Anthony DeSanctis
Reg. No. 39,957

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
7th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026
(303) 740-1980